

Endnotes

Chapter 1: Juvenile Delinquency

Table 1.1
Juvenile Arrests and Arrest Rates by Charge Severity and Charge Type
1995-2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Criminal Justice Profiles 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004* and California Department of Justice unpublished data.

Statewide trend tables for 1995 include estimated data for Oakland and Bakersfield police departments.

The Orange County Sheriff's Department identified an under reporting problem for the years 2000–2002.

Misdemeanor burglary became a new Criminal Justice Statistics Center codeable offense in 2001. Status offenses include truancy, incorrigibility, running away, and curfew violations.

Felony arrest counts may include some misdemeanor warrants for felony offenses.

Population estimates derived by the California Department of Finance.

Table 1.2
Juvenile Arrests by Charge Severity and Sex of Arrestee
1995-2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Criminal Justice Profiles 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004* and California Department of Justice unpublished data.

Statewide trend tables for 1995 include estimated data for Oakland and Bakersfield police departments.

The Orange County Sheriff's Department identified an under reporting problem for the years 2000-2002.

Felony arrest counts may include some misdemeanor warrants for felony offenses.

Table 1.3
Juvenile Felony Arrests and Arrest Rates by Charge Type
1995-2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Criminal Justice Profiles 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004* and California Department of Justice unpublished data.

Statewide trend tables for 1995 include estimated data for Oakland and Bakersfield police departments.

The Orange County Sheriff's Department identified an under reporting problem for the years 2000-2002.

Felony arrest counts may include some misdemeanor warrants for felony offenses.

Population estimates derived by the California Department of Finance.

Table 1.4
Juvenile Misdemeanor and Status Offense Arrests and Arrest Rates by Charge Type
1995-2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Criminal Justice Profiles 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004* and California Department of Justice unpublished data.

Statewide trend tables for 1995 include estimated data for Oakland and Bakersfield police departments.

Misdemeanor burglary became a new Criminal Justice Statistics Center codeable offense in 2001. Status offenses include truancy, incorrigibility, running away, and curfew violations.

The Orange County Sheriff's Department identified an under reporting problem for the years 2000-2002.

Population estimates derived by the California Department of Finance.

Table 1.5
Juvenile Arrests by Charge Severity, Charge Type, and Race/Ethnicity of Arrestee
2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Criminal Justice Profiles 2004* and California Department of Justice unpublished data.

Statewide trend tables for 1995 include estimated data for Oakland and Bakersfield police departments.

Misdemeanor burglary became a new Criminal Justice Statistics Center codeable offense in 2001. Status offenses include truancy, incorrigibility, running away, and curfew violations.

The Orange County Sheriff's Department identified an under reporting problem for the years 2000-2002.

Felony arrest counts may include some misdemeanor warrants for felony offenses.

Beginning in 2004, the race/ethnic group "other" includes the Department of Finance's new race/ethnic group of "multi-racial."

Table 1.6
Juvenile Arrests by Charge Severity, Charge Type, and Age of Arrestee
2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Criminal Justice Profiles 2004* and California Department of Justice unpublished data.

Statewide trend tables for 1995 include estimated data for Oakland and Bakersfield police departments.

Misdemeanor burglary became a new Criminal Justice Statistics Center codeable offense in 2001. Status offenses include truancy, incorrigibility, running away, and curfew violations.

The Orange County Sheriff's Department identified an under reporting problem for the years 2000-2002.

Felony arrest counts may include some misdemeanor warrants for felony offenses.

Table 1.7
Juvenile Felony Arrests by Charge Type and County
2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Criminal Justice Profiles 2004* and California Department of Justice unpublished data.

Felony arrest counts may include some misdemeanor warrants for felony offenses.

Table 1.8
Juvenile Arrests by Charge Severity and County
2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Criminal Justice Profiles 2004* and California Department of Justice unpublished data.

Misdemeanor burglary became a new Criminal Justice Statistics Center codeable offense in 2001. Status offenses include truancy, incorrigibility, running away, and curfew violations.

Felony arrest counts may include some misdemeanor warrants for felony offenses.

Table 1.9
Juvenile Arrests by County and Charge Severity
1995-2004

Originally adopted from California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center's *Criminal Justice Profiles 2001* by Special Request Unit of the Criminal Justice Statistics Center at the California Department of Justice on April 23, 2003. 2002 through 2004 data adopted from the California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center's *Criminal Justice Profiles 2002, 2003, and 2004* and California Department of Justice unpublished data by CFCC staff.

Statewide trend tables for 1995 include estimated data for Oakland and Bakersfield police departments.

Misdemeanor burglary became a new Criminal Justice Statistics Center codeable offense in 2001. Status offenses include truancy, incorrigibility, running away, and curfew violations.

The Orange County Sheriff's Department identified an under reporting problem for the years 2000-2002.

Felony arrest counts may include some misdemeanor warrants for felony offenses.

Table 1.10
Referrals of Juveniles to Probation Departments for Delinquent Acts
2002-2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Justice in California 2002, 2003, and 2004*.

The information in this table represents the data received from Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) certified counties. In 2002, 47 counties were reporting; in 2003, 50 counties were reporting; and in 2004, 52 counties were reporting. Therefore some discretion must be advised in comparing data between years.

The 11 counties not yet reporting in 2002 were: Contra Costa, Del Norte, Kings, Mendocino, Plumas, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, Sierra, and Tehama. The 8 2003 counties not reporting included Del Norte, Kings, Mariposa, Plumas, San Joaquin, Shasta, Sierra, and Tehama. In 2004, the 6 counties not reporting included Del Norte, Plumas, Riverside, San Joaquin, Sierra, and Ventura.

The Riverside County Probation Department only provided partial data for 2004 and is therefore not included in the 2004 data. The Ventura County Probation Department data was incomplete in 2004 as they were unable to provide the youth authority or juvenile hall commitments and is also not included in this in the 2004 data.

In 2003, the JCPSS was modified to accept up to five offenses per referral or petition. Previously, the JCPSS would only accept the most serious offense per referral or petition.

Data on adult referrals and dispositions was incomplete or unavailable during 2002. The number of referrals may have been overstated in 2003 due to a misreporting error in Ventura County. The decrease in referrals in 2004 may be due to Ventura County's incomplete data and exclusion from the 2004 report.

Differences between the number of referrals to probation via the JCPSS and the number of juvenile arrests reported by law enforcement agencies as "referred to juvenile court and probation" via the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) are due, in part, to the different programs and definitions used by law enforcement agencies and probation departments for submitting data to the Department of Justice (DOJ). The two primary reasons for this difference are that probation departments report caseload information while law enforcement agencies report information on individual arrests and that JCPSS counts only those juveniles who have a final disposition reported to the DOJ. Many probation departments divert juveniles out of the system into other "community based" programs. As a result, many juveniles who are diverted after being referred by law enforcement agencies are not reported on JCPSS.

Table 1.11
Juvenile Filings and Dispositions
1995-2004

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved December 21, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site, URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Subsequent delinquency case types are based on a petition filed by the district attorney that a ward of the court has committed additional acts that have violated codes or statutes. Subsequent status offense case types are based on a petition filed by the probation officer alleging that a ward of the court has committed additional status offense acts, such as truancy.

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999 and 2001 through 2004. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 through 2004. Humboldt County did not report for the year 2004.

Table 1.12
Juvenile Delinquency Filings, Dispositions, and Stage of Case at Disposition by County Court
2004

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved December 21, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site, URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Stage at disposition refers to whether the petition or notice is disposed before the start of a jurisdictional or first appearance hearing in which first evidence is presented to the court to determine whether there is sufficient evidence to sustain the allegations in the petition. First evidence is when one or more parties or

counsel appear and oral arguments, presentations relevant to the proceedings, witness testimony, and/or documents or tangible objects are submitted to the court.

Subsequent delinquency case types are based on a petition filed by the district attorney that a ward of the court has committed additional acts that have violated codes or statutes. Subsequent status offense case types are based on a petition filed by the probation officer alleging that a ward of the court has committed additional status offense acts, such as truancy.

Trinity, Modoc, and Humboldt Counties did not report for the year 2004.

Table 1.13
Original Delinquency Filings by County Court
1995–2004

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved December 21, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site, URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Subsequent delinquency case types are based on a petition filed by the district attorney that a ward of the court has committed additional acts that have violated codes or statutes. Subsequent status offense case types are based on a petition filed by the probation officer alleging that a ward of the court has committed additional status offense acts, such as truancy.

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999 and 2001 through 2004. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 through 2004. Humboldt County did not report for the year 2004.

Table 1.14
Subsequent Delinquency Filings by County Court
1995–2004

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved December 21, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site, URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Subsequent delinquency case types are based on a petition filed by the district attorney that a ward of the court has committed additional acts that have violated codes or statutes. Subsequent status offense case types are based on a petition filed by the probation officer alleging that a ward of the court has committed additional status offense acts, such as truancy.

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999 and 2001 through 2004. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 through 2004. Humboldt County did not report for the year 2004.

Table 1.15
Original Delinquency Dispositions by County Court
1995–2004

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved December 21, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site, URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Subsequent delinquency case types are based on a petition filed by the district attorney that a ward of the court has committed additional acts that have violated codes or statutes. Subsequent status offense case

types are based on a petition filed by the probation officer alleging that a ward of the court has committed additional status offense acts, such as truancy.

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999 and 2001 through 2004. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 through 2004. Humboldt County did not report for the year 2004.

Table 1.16
Subsequent Delinquency Dispositions by County Court
1995-2004

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved December 21, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site, URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Subsequent delinquency case types are based on a petition filed by the district attorney that a ward of the court has committed additional acts that have violated codes or statutes. Subsequent status offense case types are based on a petition filed by the probation officer alleging that a ward of the court has committed additional status offense acts, such as truancy.

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999 and 2001 through 2004. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 through 2004. Humboldt County did not report for the year 2004.

Table 1.17
Original Status Offense Filings by County Court
1995-2004

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved December 21, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site, URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Subsequent delinquency case types are based on a petition filed by the district attorney that a ward of the court has committed additional acts that have violated codes or statutes. Subsequent status offense case types are based on a petition filed by the probation officer alleging that a ward of the court has committed additional status offense acts, such as truancy.

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999 and 2001 through 2004. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 through 2004. Humboldt County did not report for the year 2004.

Table 1.18
Subsequent Status Offense Filings by County Court
1995-2004

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved December 21, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site, URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Subsequent delinquency case types are based on a petition filed by the district attorney that a ward of the court has committed additional acts that have violated codes or statutes. Subsequent status offense case types are based on a petition filed by the probation officer alleging that a ward of the court has committed additional status offense acts, such as truancy.

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999 and 2001 through 2004. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 through 2004. Humboldt County did not report for the year 2004.

Table 1.19
Original Status Offense Dispositions by County Court
1995-2004

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved December 21, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site, URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Subsequent delinquency case types are based on a petition filed by the district attorney that a ward of the court has committed additional acts that have violated codes or statutes. Subsequent status offense case types are based on a petition filed by the probation officer alleging that a ward of the court has committed additional status offense acts, such as truancy.

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999 and 2001 through 2004. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 through 2004. Humboldt County did not report for the year 2004.

Table 1.20
Subsequent Status Offense Dispositions by County Court
1995-2004

Judicial Council of California, Administrative Office of the Courts, Judicial Branch Statistical Information System (JBSIS). Retrieved December 21, 2005, from the JBSIS Web site, URL: <http://jbsis.courts.ca.gov/> (restricted access site).

Subsequent delinquency case types are based on a petition filed by the district attorney that a ward of the court has committed additional acts that have violated codes or statutes. Subsequent status offense case types are based on a petition filed by the probation officer alleging that a ward of the court has committed additional status offense acts, such as truancy.

Trinity County did not report for the years 1999 and 2001 through 2004. Modoc County did not report for the years 2002 through 2004. Humboldt County did not report for the year 2004.

Table 1.21
Juvenile Court Dispositions Resulting from Petitions for Delinquent Acts
2002-2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Justice in California 2002, 2003, and 2004*.

The information in this table represents the data received from Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) certified counties. In 2002, 47 counties were reporting; in 2003, 50 counties were reporting; and in 2004, 52 counties were reporting. Therefore some discretion must be advised in comparing data between years.

The 11 counties not yet reporting in 2002 were: Contra Costa, Del Norte, Kings, Mendocino, Plumas, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Joaquin, San Luis Obispo, Sierra, and Tehama. The 8 2003 counties not reporting included Del Norte, Kings, Mariposa, Plumas, San Joaquin, Shasta, Sierra, and Tehama. In 2004, the 6 counties not reporting included Del Norte, Plumas, Riverside, San Joaquin, Sierra, and Ventura.

The Riverside County Probation Department only provided partial data for 2004 and is therefore not included in the 2004 data. The Ventura County Probation Department data was incomplete in 2004 as they were unable to provide the youth authority or juvenile hall commitments and is also not included in this in the 2004 data.

In 2003, the JCPSS was modified to accept up to five offenses per referral or petition. Previously, the JCPSS would only accept the most serious offense per referral or petition.

Data on adult referrals and dispositions was incomplete or unavailable during 2002. The number of referrals may have been overstated in 2003 due to a misreporting error in Ventura County. The decrease in referrals in 2004 may be due to Ventura County's incomplete data and exclusion from the 2004 report.

Differences between the number of referrals to probation via the JCPSS and the number of juvenile arrests reported by law enforcement agencies as "referred to juvenile court and probation" via the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) are due, in part, to the different programs and definitions used by law enforcement agencies and probation departments for submitting data to the Department of Justice (DOJ). The two primary reasons for this difference are that probation departments report caseload information while law enforcement agencies report information on individual arrests and that JCPSS counts only those juveniles who have a final disposition reported to the DOJ. Many probation departments divert juveniles out of the system into other "community based" programs. As a result, many juveniles who are diverted after being referred by law enforcement agencies are not reported on JCPSS.

Table 1.22
Juvenile Probation Department's Caseload by Case Type and County
December 31, 2002

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Probation Caseloads, 1996-2002*.

Formal wardship status designates a child who is declared a ward of the juvenile court and placed on formal probation.

Informal status designates a child who is supervised, in place of filing a petition, for a period not to exceed six months (under codes 654, 654.2 or 654.3 W&I).

Non-ward status designates a child that is under a probation grant from juvenile court for a specific time of less than six months and does not have wardship status (under code 725(a) W&I).

Deferred entry of judgment designates a child who is supervised without a dispositional hearing between 12 and 36 months from the date of the referral to the program (790 W&I).

Diversion designates any delivery or referral by the probation department of a child to a public or private agency with which the city or county has an agreement to provide shelter care, counseling, or other diversion services. Probation services must make the referral to diversion and continue to maintain responsibility for the child's progress for a specific amount of time.

Table 1.23
Juvenile Probation Department's Caseload by Type and Sex and County
December 31, 2002

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Probation Caseloads, 1996-2002*.

Formal wardship status designates a child who is declared a ward of the juvenile court and placed on formal probation.

Informal status designates a child who is supervised, in place of filing a petition, for a period of less than six months (under codes 654, 654.2 or 654.3 W&I).

Non-ward status designates a child who is under a probation grant from juvenile court for a specific time not to exceed six months and does not have wardship status (under code 725(a) W&I).

Deferred entry of judgment designates a child who is supervised without a dispositional hearing between 12 and 36 months from the date of the referral to the program (790 W&I).

Diversion designates any delivery or referral by the probation department of a child to a public or private agency with which the city or county has an agreement to provide shelter care, counseling, or other diversion services. Probation services must make the referral to diversion and continue to maintain responsibility for the child's progress for a specific amount of time.

Table 1.24
Juvenile Probation Caseload, Probation Cases Only
December 31, 1996-2002

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Probation Caseloads, 1996-2002*.

Changes from 1996 to 1999 may reflect programmatic adjustments made by the reporting agency.

Formal wardship status designates a child that is declared a ward of the juvenile court and placed on formal probation.

Informal status designates a child who is supervised, in place of filing a petition, for a period of less than six months (under codes 654, 654.2 or 654.3 W&I).

Non-ward status designates a child who is under a probation grant from juvenile court for a specific time not to exceed six months and does not have wardship status (under code 725(a) W&I).

Table 1.25
Juvenile Probation Caseload, Informal Probation
December 31, 1996-2002

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Probation Caseloads, 1996-2002*.

Changes from 1996 to 1999 may reflect programmatic adjustments made by the reporting agency.

Informal status designates a child who is supervised, in place of filing a petition, for a period of less than six months (under codes 654, 654.2 or 654.3 W&I).

Table 1.26
Juvenile Probation Caseload, Non-Ward
December 31, 1996-2002

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Probation Caseloads, 1996-2002*.

Changes from 1996 to 1999 may reflect programmatic adjustments made by the reporting agency.

Non-ward status designates a child who is under a probation grant from juvenile court for a specific time of less than six months and does not have wardship status (under code 725(a) W&I).

Table 1.27
Juvenile Probation Caseload, Formal Wardship
December 31, 1996-2002

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Probation Caseloads, 1996-2002*.

Changes from 1996 to 1999 may reflect programmatic adjustments made by the reporting agency.

San Joaquin and Solano Counties included their non-ward totals with the formal wardship data in years 1998-2002.

Formal wardship status designates a child who is declared a ward of the juvenile court and placed on formal probation.

Table 1.28
Children in Probation Supervised Foster Care by Placement Type and Race/Ethnicity
January 1, 2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved January 6, 2006, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Race/ethnicity categories are Black, White (including White, White-Armenian, White-Central American, White-European, White-Middle Eastern, and White-Romanian), Hispanic (Hispanic, Mexican, South American, Caribbean, or those coded as being of Hispanic origin), Black, Asian (Asian Indian, Cambodian, Chinese, Ethiopian, Filipino, Guamanian, Hawaiian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Other Asian/Pacific Islander, Hmong, Polynesian, Samoan, and Vietnamese), and Native American (Alaskan Native and American Indian).

Children with an open out-of-home placement record on the study date are categorized according to the placement type corresponding with that point in time, including: Kinship, Foster Family (Non-Relative), Foster Family (Non-Relative; Agency), Court Specified Home, Group, Shelter, Guardian, or Transitional Housing.

Children with an open placement episode, but not an open out-of-home placement record, are coded as being in Non-Foster Care if they have an open placement in that table on the study date, and on a Trial Home Visit or as a Runaway if the placement change reason of the last placement indicated such.

Children with an open placement episode, no open out-of-home placement, and no reliable data regarding why, are coded as Other.

Table 1.29
Children in Probation Supervised Foster Care by Placement Type and Race/Ethnicity
January 1, 2005

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved January 6, 2006, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Race/ethnicity categories are Black, White (including White, White-Armenian, White-Central American, White-European, White-Middle Eastern, and White-Romanian), Hispanic (Hispanic, Mexican, South American, Caribbean, or those coded as being of Hispanic origin), Black, Asian (Asian Indian, Cambodian, Chinese, Ethiopian, Filipino, Guamanian, Hawaiian, Japanese, Korean, Laotian, Other Asian/Pacific Islander, Hmong, Polynesian, Samoan, and Vietnamese), and Native American (Alaskan Native and American Indian).

Children with an open out-of-home placement record on the study date are categorized according to the placement type corresponding with that point in time, including: Kinship, Foster Family (Non-Relative), Foster Family (Non-Relative; Agency), Court Specified Home, Group, Shelter, Guardian, or Transitional Housing.

Children with an open placement episode, but not an open out-of-home placement record, are coded as being in Non-Foster Care if they have an open placement in that table on the study date, and on a Trial Home Visit or as a Runaway if the placement change reason of the last placement indicated such.

Children with an open placement episode, no open out-of-home placement, and no reliable data regarding why, are coded as Other.

Table 1.30
Children in Probation Supervised Foster Care by Placement Type and Age
January 1, 2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved January 6, 2006, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Children with an open out-of-home placement record on the study date are categorized according to the placement type corresponding with that point in time, including: Kinship, Foster Family (Non-Relative), Foster Family (Non-Relative; Agency), Court Specified Home, Group, Shelter, Guardian, or Transitional Housing.

Children with an open placement episode, but not an open out-of-home placement record, are coded as being in Non-Foster Care if they have an open placement in that table on the study date, and on a Trial Home Visit or as a Runaway if the placement change reason of the last placement indicated such.

Children with an open placement episode, no open out-of-home placement, and no reliable data regarding why, are coded as Other.

Table 1.31
Children in Probation Supervised Foster Care by Placement Type and Age
January 1, 2005

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved January 6, 2006, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Children with an open out-of-home placement record on the study date are categorized according to the placement type corresponding with that point in time, including: Kinship, Foster Family (Non-Relative), Foster Family (Non-Relative; Agency), Court Specified Home, Group, Shelter, Guardian, or Transitional Housing.

Children with an open placement episode, but not an open out-of-home placement record, are coded as being in Non-Foster Care if they have an open placement in that table on the study date, and on a Trial Home Visit or as a Runaway if the placement change reason of the last placement indicated such.

Children with an open placement episode, no open out-of-home placement, and no reliable data regarding why, are coded as Other.

Table 1.32
Children in Probation Supervised Foster Care by Placement Type and Sex
January 1, 2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved January 6, 2006, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Children with an open out-of-home placement record on the study date are categorized according to the placement type corresponding with that point in time, including: Kinship, Foster Family (Non-Relative), Foster Family (Non-Relative; Agency), Court Specified Home, Group, Shelter, Guardian, or Transitional Housing.

Children with an open placement episode, but not an open out-of-home placement record, are coded as being in Non-Foster Care if they have an open placement in that table on the study date, and on a Trial Home Visit or as a Runaway if the placement change reason of the last placement indicated such.

Children with an open placement episode, no open out-of-home placement, and no reliable data regarding why, are coded as Other.

Table 1.33
Children in Probation Supervised Foster Care by Placement Type and Sex
January 1, 2005

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved January 6, 2006, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Children with an open out-of-home placement record on the study date are categorized according to the placement type corresponding with that point in time, including: Kinship, Foster Family (Non-Relative),

Foster Family (Non-Relative; Agency), Court Specified Home, Group, Shelter, Guardian, or Transitional Housing.

Children with an open placement episode, but not an open out-of-home placement record, are coded as being in Non-Foster Care if they have an open placement in that table on the study date, and on a Trial Home Visit or as a Runaway if the placement change reason of the last placement indicated such.

Children with an open placement episode, no open out-of-home placement, and no reliable data regarding why, are coded as Other.

Table 1.34
Children in Probation Supervised Foster Care by Supervising County and In-County Placement
July 1, 2002-2004

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved January 6, 2006, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

These tables are based on data about children who were placed in Kinship, Foster, Foster Family Agencies (FFA's), or Group Homes on July 1 of 2001, 2002, and 2003. Supervising County refers to the county responsible for the child's case. In County refers to the county where the placement facility is physically located.

Table 1.35
Children in Probation Supervised Foster Care by Placement Type
January 1, 2001-2005

Needell, B., Webster, D., Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Armijo, M., Lee, S., Lery, B., Shaw, T., Dawson, W., Piccus, W., Magruder, J., Kim, H., Conley, A., Henry, C., Korinek, P., Paredes, C., & Smith, J. (2005). Child Welfare Services Reports for California. Retrieved January 6, 2006, from University of California at Berkeley Center for Social Services Research Web site. URL: <http://cssr.berkeley.edu/CWSCMSreports/>

Children with an open out-of-home placement record on the study date are categorized according to the placement type corresponding with that point in time, including: Kinship, Foster Family (Non-Relative), Foster Family (Non-Relative; Agency), Court Specified Home, Group, Shelter, Guardian, or Transitional Housing.

Children with an open placement episode, but not an open out-of-home placement record, are coded as being in Non-Foster Care if they have an open placement in that table on the study date, and on a Trial Home Visit or as a Runaway if the placement change reason of the last placement indicated such.

Children with an open placement episode, no open out-of-home placement, and no reliable data regarding why, are coded as Other.

Table 1.36
Juvenile Restorative Justice Services
2002

Unpublished data from California Administrative Office of the Courts, Center for Families, Children & the Courts 2002 Survey of Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ) Services, received on March 2, 2006.

A number of the counties listed as not having any restorative justice programs do have deferred entry of judgment, restorative community service programs, and restitution services that collect and distribute restitution in a restorative way. During the data cleaning process, these categories were removed from the data, as they are available in all California counties.

Table 1.37
Juvenile Restorative Justice Services by County
2002

Unpublished data from California Administrative Office of the Courts, Center for Families, Children & the Courts 2002 Survey of Balanced and Restorative Justice (BARJ) Services, received on March 2, 2006.

A number of the counties listed as not having any restorative justice programs do have deferred entry of judgment, restorative community service programs, and restitution services that collect and distribute restitution in a restorative way. During the data cleaning process, these categories were removed from the data, as they are available in all California counties.

Table 1.38
Average Daily Population of Juveniles in Custody by County
First Quarter 1999-2005

California Board of Corrections, *Juvenile Detention Profile Survey: First Quarter Results 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005*.

Average Daily Population (ADP) on County Breakout Report may not equal ADP on other Summary Reports due to rounding

Table 1.39
Population Characteristics of Juveniles in Custody by Year
1999-2004

California Board of Corrections, *Annual Juvenile Detention Survey Reports 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2004*.

Average Daily Population (ADP) is determined by counting the number of juveniles in custody each day of the month, summing the daily counts, and dividing the sum by the number of days in the month.

Average Length of Stay (ALS) is calculated by taking the number of days served by each juvenile released from detention during the quarter, summing these numbers, and dividing by the number of juveniles who were released. Length of stay for each individual includes all continuous days served from date of intake until date of release, including any days served during previous reporting periods.

Board Rated Capacity (BRC) is the maximum population a facility may have based on the assessment of the Board of Corrections.

Table 1.40
Critical Identifiers of Juveniles in Custody by Year (Average per Quarter)
1999-2004

California Board of Corrections, *Annual Juvenile Detention Survey Report 2004*.

707 (b) offenses are specific serious felonies as delineated in Section 707 (b) of the Welfare and Institutions Code (WIC) alleged to have been committed by a juvenile age 16 or older.

A 707.01 WIC minor has been found as an unfit subject for juvenile court and has been remanded to the adult court, pursuant to Section 707.01 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

Court commitments to juvenile hall (Ricardo M.) designate cases that fall under the decision of California appellate court case *In re Ricardo M.* (1975) 52 CA3d 744 concerning a period of confinement in juvenile hall as a condition of probation.

Table 1.41
First Commitments to the California Youth Authority by Committing Court and Commitment Rates 1995-2004

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), *A Comparison of First-Commitment Characteristics, 1994-2005*. Retrieved November 18, 2005, from the DJJ Web site, URL: http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/ReportsResearch/research_tips.html.

In 2005, the California Youth Authority (CYA) became the Juvenile Justice Division under the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

DJJ cases are those in which youth are committed directly to the Youth Authority by either juvenile court or criminal court. In California Department of Corrections (CDC) cases youth are committed to prison by criminal court but ordered to serve at least part of their sentence in Youth Authority facilities.

Population estimates derived by the California Department of Finance.

Table 1.42
First Commitments and Commitment Rates to the California Youth Authority by County Court 2004

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Juvenile Justice unpublished data.

In 2005, the California Youth Authority (CYA) became the Juvenile Justice Division under the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

DJJ cases are those in which youth are committed directly to the Youth Authority by either juvenile court or criminal court. In California Department of Corrections cases youth are committed to prison by criminal court but ordered to serve at least part of their sentence in Youth Authority facilities.

Population estimates derived by the California Department of Finance.

Totals and commitment rates recalculated by Center for Families, Children & the courts (CFCC) staff.

Table 1.43
Characteristics of First Commitments to the Youth Authority, CYA and CDC Cases Combined 1995-2004

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), *A Comparison of First-Commitment Characteristics, 1994-2005*. Retrieved November 18, 2005, from the DJJ Web site, URL: http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/ReportsResearch/research_tips.html.

In 2005, the California Youth Authority (CYA) became the Juvenile Justice Division under the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

DJJ cases are those in which youth are committed directly to the Youth Authority by either juvenile court or criminal court. In California Department of Corrections cases youth are committed to prison by criminal court but ordered to serve at least part of their sentence in Youth Authority facilities.

Missing data in the religion variable includes “not available”, “no preference”, and atheist.

Table 1.44
Characteristics of First Commitments to the Youth Authority, CYA Cases Only
1995-2004

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), *A Comparison of First-Commitment Characteristics, 1994-2005*. Retrieved November 18, 2005, from the DJJ Web site, URL: http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/ReportsResearch/research_tips.html.

In 2005, the California Youth Authority (CYA) became the Juvenile Justice Division under the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

DJJ cases are those in which youth are committed directly to the Youth Authority by either juvenile court or criminal court. In California Department of Corrections cases youth are committed to prison by criminal court but ordered to serve at least part of their sentence in Youth Authority facilities.

Missing data in the religion variable includes “not available,” “no preference,” and atheist.

Table 1.45
Characteristics of First Commitments to the Youth Authority, CDC Cases Only
1995-2004

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Division of Juvenile Justice (DJJ), *A Comparison of First-Commitment Characteristics, 1994-2005*. Retrieved November 18, 2005, from the DJJ Web site, URL: http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/ReportsResearch/research_tips.html.

In 2005, the California Youth Authority (CYA) became the Juvenile Justice Division under the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

DJJ cases are those in which youth are committed directly to the Youth Authority by either juvenile court or criminal court. In California Department of Corrections cases youth are committed to prison by criminal court but ordered to serve at least part of their sentence in Youth Authority facilities.

Missing data in the religion variable includes “not available,” “no preference,” and atheist.

Table 1.46
Characteristics of Males in Youth Correctional Conservation Camps
June 30, 1995-2004

California Department of the Youth Authority, *A Comparison of the Youth Authority's Institution and Parole Populations: June 30 Each Year, 1995-2004*. Retrieved November 18, 2005, from the DJJ Web site, URL: http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/ReportsResearch/research_tips.html.

In 2005, the California Youth Authority (CYA) became the Juvenile Justice Division under the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

DJJ cases are those in which youth are committed directly to the Youth Authority by either juvenile court or criminal court. In California Department of Corrections cases youth are committed to prison by criminal court but ordered to serve at least part of their sentence in Youth Authority facilities.

Totals may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 1.47
Characteristics of Males in Youth Correctional Facilities and Conservation Camps
June 30, 1995-2004

California Department of the Youth Authority, *A Comparison of the Youth Authority's Institution and Parole Populations: June 30 Each Year, 1995-2004*. Retrieved November 18, 2005, from the DJJ Web site, URL: http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/ReportsResearch/research_tips.html.

In 2005, the California Youth Authority (CYA) became the Juvenile Justice Division under the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

DJJ cases are those in which youth are committed directly to the Youth Authority by either juvenile court or criminal court. In California Department of Corrections cases youth are committed to prison by criminal court but ordered to serve at least part of their sentence in Youth Authority facilities.

Karl Holton Youth Correctional Drug and Alcohol Treatment Facility moved wards out gradually until the last wards left on September 25, 2003. Fred C. Nelles Youth Correctional Facility and Mt. Bullion Youth Conservation Camp gradually moved wards out until the end of May 2004. All of the males were moved out of the Ventura Youth Correctional Facility by January 1, 2004. This explains the drastic drop in their populations.

Totals may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 1.48
Characteristics of the Youth Authority's Institution Population
June 30, 1995-2004

California Department of the Youth Authority, *A Comparison of the Youth Authority's Institution and Parole Populations: June 30 Each Year, 1995-2004*. Retrieved November 18, 2005, from the DJJ Web site, URL: http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/ReportsResearch/research_tips.html.

In 2005, the California Youth Authority (CYA) became the Juvenile Justice Division under the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

DJJ cases are those in which youth are committed directly to the Youth Authority by either juvenile court or criminal court. In California Department of Corrections cases youth are committed to prison by criminal court but ordered to serve at least part of their sentence in Youth Authority facilities.

Totals may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 1.49
Characteristics of the Youth Authority's Parole Population, CYA Cases
June 30, 1995-2004

California Department of the Youth Authority, *A Comparison of the Youth Authority's Institution and Parole Populations: June 30 Each Year, 1995-2004*. Retrieved November 18, 2005, from the DJJ Web site, URL: http://www.cdcr.ca.gov/ReportsResearch/research_tips.html.

In 2005, the California Youth Authority (CYA) became the Juvenile Justice Division under the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation.

DJJ cases are those in which youth are committed directly to the Youth Authority by either juvenile court or criminal court. In California Department of Corrections cases youth are committed to prison by criminal court but ordered to serve at least part of their sentence in Youth Authority facilities.

CDC cases were no longer paroled to the Youth Authority beginning in fiscal year 1999-2000.

Totals may not add to 100 percent because of rounding.

Table 1.50
Enrollment in California Youth Authority Schools by Grade and Year
1998-99 to 2003-04

California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit's DataQuest system. Retrieved January 8, 2006.

Table 1.51
California Youth Authority Personnel and Expenditures
1995-2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Criminal Justice Profiles 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004*.

Department of Corrections and Youth Authority personnel are fiscal-year counts obtained from the State of California Governor's Budget.

Fiscal year begins on July 1 of each calendar year.

Expenditure data for fiscal year 2003-2004 were not available from the Office of the State Controller in time for inclusion in this publication.

Expenditures include services, supplies, salaries, and employee benefits. Building construction and capital expenditures are not included. Expenditures for state agencies are shown only in the Statewide Criminal Justice Profile.

Table 1.52
Referrals of Juveniles to Adult Court by Type of Referral and Race/Ethnicity
2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Justice in California 2004*.

The information in this table represents the data received from 52 Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) certified counties. The 6 counties not yet reporting are: Del Norte, Plumas, Riverside, San Joaquin, Sierra, and Ventura.

The Riverside County Probation Department only provided partial data for 2004 and is therefore not included in this report. The Ventura County Probation Department data was incomplete in 2004 as they

were unable to provide the youth authority or juvenile hall commitments and is also not included in this report.

Differences between the number of referrals to probation via the JCPSS and the number of juvenile arrests reported by law enforcement agencies as “referred to juvenile court and probation” via the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) are due, in part, to the different programs and definitions used by law enforcement agencies and probation departments for submitting data to the Department of Justice (DOJ). The two primary reasons for this difference are that probation departments report caseload information while law enforcement agencies report information on individual arrests and that JCPSS counts only those juveniles who have a final disposition reported to the DOJ. Many probation departments divert juveniles out of the system into other “community based” programs. As a result, many juveniles who are diverted after being referred by law enforcement agencies are not reported on JCPSS.

A direct file in adult court is the transfer by the district attorney of a juvenile offender who is alleged to have committed murder, rape, spousal rape, forcible sex offense, lewd and lascivious acts on a child under the age of 14 years, or forcible sexual penetration, sodomy, or oral copulation to a court of criminal jurisdiction (602(b) W&I).

A fitness hearing is a hearing to determine whether the juvenile is a fit and proper subject to be dealt with under juvenile court law. If the juvenile is found fit, adjudication remains in the juvenile court. If the juvenile is found unfit, adjudication is transferred to the adult court (707(b) W&I).

Table 1.53
Referrals of Juveniles to Adult Court by Type of Referral and Age
2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Justice in California 2004*.

The information in this table represents the data received from 52 Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) certified counties. The 6 counties not yet reporting are: Del Norte, Plumas, Riverside, San Joaquin, Sierra, and Ventura.

The Riverside County Probation Department only provided partial data for 2004 and is therefore not included in this report. The Ventura County Probation Department data was incomplete in 2004 as they were unable to provide the youth authority or juvenile hall commitments and is also not included in this report.

Differences between the number of referrals to probation via the JCPSS and the number of juvenile arrests reported by law enforcement agencies as “referred to juvenile court and probation” via the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) are due, in part, to the different programs and definitions used by law enforcement agencies and probation departments for submitting data to the Department of Justice (DOJ). The two primary reasons for this difference are that probation departments report caseload information while law enforcement agencies report information on individual arrests and that JCPSS counts only those juveniles who have a final disposition reported to the DOJ. Many probation departments divert juveniles out of the system into other “community based” programs. As a result, many juveniles who are diverted after being referred by law enforcement agencies are not reported on JCPSS.

A direct file in adult court is the transfer by the district attorney of a juvenile offender who is alleged to have committed murder, rape, spousal rape, forcible sex offense, lewd and lascivious acts on a child under the age of 14 years, or forcible sexual penetration, sodomy, or oral copulation to a court of criminal jurisdiction (602(b) W&I).

A fitness hearing is a hearing to determine whether the juvenile is a fit and proper subject to be dealt with under juvenile court law. If the juvenile is found fit, adjudication remains in the juvenile court. If the juvenile is found unfit, adjudication is transferred to the adult court (707(b) W&I).

Table 1.54
Referrals of Juveniles to Adult Court by Type of Referral and Sex
2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Justice in California 2004*.

The information in this table represents the data received from 52 Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) certified counties. The 6 counties not yet reporting are: Del Norte, Plumas, Riverside, San Joaquin, Sierra, and Ventura.

The Riverside County Probation Department only provided partial data for 2004 and is therefore not included in this report. The Ventura County Probation Department data was incomplete in 2004 as they were unable to provide the youth authority or juvenile hall commitments and is also not included in this report.

Differences between the number of referrals to probation via the JCPSS and the number of juvenile arrests reported by law enforcement agencies as “referred to juvenile court and probation” via the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) are due, in part, to the different programs and definitions used by law enforcement agencies and probation departments for submitting data to the Department of Justice (DOJ). The two primary reasons for this difference are that probation departments report caseload information while law enforcement agencies report information on individual arrests and that JCPSS counts only those juveniles who have a final disposition reported to the DOJ. Many probation departments divert juveniles out of the system into other “community based” programs. As a result, many juveniles who are diverted after being referred by law enforcement agencies are not reported on JCPSS.

A direct file in adult court is the transfer by the district attorney of a juvenile offender who is alleged to have committed murder, rape, spousal rape, forcible sex offense, lewd and lascivious acts on a child under the age of 14 years, or forcible sexual penetration, sodomy, or oral copulation to a court of criminal jurisdiction (602(b) W&I).

A fitness hearing is a hearing to determine whether the juvenile is a fit and proper subject to be dealt with under juvenile court law. If the juvenile is found fit, adjudication remains in the juvenile court. If the juvenile is found unfit, adjudication is transferred to the adult court (707(b) W&I).

Table 1.55
Number of Juvenile Court Fitness Hearings Ordered by Outcome and Race/Ethnicity
2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Justice in California 2004*.

The information in this table represents the data received from 52 Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) certified counties. The 6 counties not yet reporting are: Del Norte, Plumas, Riverside, San Joaquin, Sierra, and Ventura.

The Riverside County Probation Department only provided partial data for 2004 and is therefore not included in this report. The Ventura County Probation Department data was incomplete in 2004 as they were unable to provide the youth authority or juvenile hall commitments and is also not included in this report.

Differences between the number of referrals to probation via the JCPSS and the number of juvenile arrests reported by law enforcement agencies as “referred to juvenile court and probation” via the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) are due, in part, to the different programs and definitions used by law enforcement agencies and probation departments for submitting data to the Department of Justice

(DOJ). The two primary reasons for this difference are that probation departments report caseload information while law enforcement agencies report information on individual arrests and that JCPSS counts only those juveniles who have a final disposition reported to the DOJ. Many probation departments divert juveniles out of the system into other “community based” programs. As a result, many juveniles who are diverted after being referred by law enforcement agencies are not reported on JCPSS.

A fitness hearing is a hearing to determine whether the juvenile is a fit and proper subject to be dealt with under juvenile court law. If the juvenile is found fit, adjudication remains in the juvenile court. If the juvenile is found unfit, adjudication is transferred to the adult court (707(b) W&I).

Table 1.56
Number of Juvenile Court Fitness Hearings Ordered by Outcome and Age
2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Justice in California 2004*.

The information in this table represents the data received from 52 Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) certified counties. The 6 counties not yet reporting are: Del Norte, Plumas, Riverside, San Joaquin, Sierra, and Ventura.

The Riverside County Probation Department only provided partial data for 2004 and is therefore not included in this report. The Ventura County Probation Department data was incomplete in 2004 as they were unable to provide the youth authority or juvenile hall commitments and is also not included in this report.

Differences between the number of referrals to probation via the JCPSS and the number of juvenile arrests reported by law enforcement agencies as “referred to juvenile court and probation” via the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) are due, in part, to the different programs and definitions used by law enforcement agencies and probation departments for submitting data to the Department of Justice (DOJ). The two primary reasons for this difference are that probation departments report caseload information while law enforcement agencies report information on individual arrests and that JCPSS counts only those juveniles who have a final disposition reported to the DOJ. Many probation departments divert juveniles out of the system into other “community based” programs. As a result, many juveniles who are diverted after being referred by law enforcement agencies are not reported on JCPSS.

A fitness hearing is a hearing to determine whether the juvenile is a fit and proper subject to be dealt with under juvenile court law. If the juvenile is found fit, adjudication remains in the juvenile court. If the juvenile is found unfit, adjudication is transferred to the adult court (707(b) W&I).

Table 1.57
Number of Juvenile Court Fitness Hearings Ordered by Outcome and Sex
2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Justice in California 2004*.

The information in this table represents the data received from 52 Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) certified counties. The 6 counties not yet reporting are: Del Norte, Plumas, Riverside, San Joaquin, Sierra, and Ventura.

The Riverside County Probation Department only provided partial data for 2004 and is therefore not included in this report. The Ventura County Probation Department data was incomplete in 2004 as they were unable to provide the youth authority or juvenile hall commitments and is also not included in this report.

Differences between the number of referrals to probation via the JCPSS and the number of juvenile arrests reported by law enforcement agencies as “referred to juvenile court and probation” via the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) are due, in part, to the different programs and definitions used by law enforcement agencies and probation departments for submitting data to the Department of Justice (DOJ). The two primary reasons for this difference are that probation departments report caseload information while law enforcement agencies report information on individual arrests and that JCPSS counts only those juveniles who have a final disposition reported to the DOJ. Many probation departments divert juveniles out of the system into other “community based” programs. As a result, many juveniles who are diverted after being referred by law enforcement agencies are not reported on JCPSS.

A fitness hearing is a hearing to determine whether the juvenile is a fit and proper subject to be dealt with under juvenile court law. If the juvenile is found fit, adjudication remains in the juvenile court. If the juvenile is found unfit, adjudication is transferred to the adult court (707(b) W&I).

Table 1.58
Juveniles in Adult Court by Offense Level, Disposition, and Race/Ethnicity
2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Justice in California 2004*.

The information in this table represents the data received from 52 Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) certified counties. The 6 counties not yet reporting are: Del Norte, Plumas, Riverside, San Joaquin, Sierra, and Ventura.

The Riverside County Probation Department only provided partial data for 2004 and is therefore not included in this report. The Ventura County Probation Department data was incomplete in 2004 as they were unable to provide the youth authority or juvenile hall commitments and is also not included in this report.

Differences between the number of referrals to probation via the JCPSS and the number of juvenile arrests reported by law enforcement agencies as “referred to juvenile court and probation” via the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) are due, in part, to the different programs and definitions used by law enforcement agencies and probation departments for submitting data to the Department of Justice (DOJ). The two primary reasons for this difference are that probation departments report caseload information while law enforcement agencies report information on individual arrests and that JCPSS counts only those juveniles who have a final disposition reported to the DOJ. Many probation departments divert juveniles out of the system into other “community based” programs. As a result, many juveniles who are diverted after being referred by law enforcement agencies are not reported on JCPSS.

Adult disposition information includes those juveniles aged 14 to 17 who received an adult level disposition in 2004. The number of adult dispositions received in 2004 that meet the above criteria will not equal the number of juveniles transferred to the adult system for prosecution. Because of differences between the adult and juvenile systems, not every case transferred to the adult system is adjudicated in the same year.

For adult dispositions with multiple offenses, the most serious offense with the most severe punishment was used in the analysis.

Table 1.59
Juveniles in Adult Court by Offense Level, Disposition, and Age
2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Justice in California 2004*.

The information in this table represents the data received from 52 Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) certified counties. The 6 counties not yet reporting are: Del Norte, Plumas, Riverside, San Joaquin, Sierra, and Ventura.

The Riverside County Probation Department only provided partial data for 2004 and is therefore not included in this report. The Ventura County Probation Department data was incomplete in 2004 as they were unable to provide the youth authority or juvenile hall commitments and is also not included in this report.

Differences between the number of referrals to probation via the JCPSS and the number of juvenile arrests reported by law enforcement agencies as “referred to juvenile court and probation” via the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) are due, in part, to the different programs and definitions used by law enforcement agencies and probation departments for submitting data to the Department of Justice (DOJ). The two primary reasons for this difference are that probation departments report caseload information while law enforcement agencies report information on individual arrests and that JCPSS counts only those juveniles who have a final disposition reported to the DOJ. Many probation departments divert juveniles out of the system into other “community based” programs. As a result, many juveniles who are diverted after being referred by law enforcement agencies are not reported on JCPSS.

Adult disposition information includes those juveniles aged 14 to 17 who received an adult level disposition in 2004. The number of adult dispositions received in 2004 that meet the above criteria will not equal the number of juveniles transferred to the adult system for prosecution. Because of differences between the adult and juvenile systems, not every case transferred to the adult system is adjudicated in the same year.

For adult dispositions with multiple offenses, the most serious offense with the most severe punishment was used in the analysis.

Table 1.60
Juveniles in Adult Court by Offense Level, Disposition, and Sex
2004

California Department of Justice, Criminal Justice Statistics Center, *Juvenile Justice in California 2004*.

The information in this table represents the data received from 52 Juvenile Court and Probation Statistical System (JCPSS) certified counties. The 6 counties not yet reporting are: Del Norte, Plumas, Riverside, San Joaquin, Sierra, and Ventura.

The Riverside County Probation Department only provided partial data for 2004 and is therefore not included in this report. The Ventura County Probation Department data was incomplete in 2004 as they were unable to provide the youth authority or juvenile hall commitments and is also not included in this report.

Differences between the number of referrals to probation via the JCPSS and the number of juvenile arrests reported by law enforcement agencies as “referred to juvenile court and probation” via the Monthly Arrest and Citation Register (MACR) are due, in part, to the different programs and definitions used by law enforcement agencies and probation departments for submitting data to the Department of Justice (DOJ). The two primary reasons for this difference are that probation departments report caseload information while law enforcement agencies report information on individual arrests and that JCPSS counts only those juveniles who have a final disposition reported to the DOJ. Many probation departments divert juveniles out of the system into other “community based” programs. As a result, many juveniles who are diverted after being referred by law enforcement agencies are not reported on JCPSS.

Adult disposition information includes those juveniles aged 14 to 17 who received an adult level disposition in 2004. The number of adult dispositions received in 2004 that meet the above criteria will not

equal the number of juveniles transferred to the adult system for prosecution. Because of differences between the adult and juvenile systems, not every case transferred to the adult system is adjudicated in the same year.

For adult dispositions with multiple offenses, the most serious offense with the most severe punishment was used in the analysis.

Table 1.61
Peer Courts by County Court
2001 and 2005

California Administrative Office of the Courts, Executive Office Programs, Collaborative Justice Survey, July 2001 and 2005 administrative records.